

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,515	BUSKOP, JACQUELINE EVYNNE BREUNINGER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David C. Reese	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David C. Reese. (3) _____.

(2) Wendy Buskop. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 April 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ROBERT J. SANDY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner extended the courtesy to grant an unscheduled interview with Ms. Buskop, as the case is currently also under a final rejection. Interview began with Ms. Buskop discussing possible amendments to claim 1, including that of amending the claim 1 to incorporate "consisting of" language. Examiner consequently stated that said amendments would be considered new issues and would require further consideration to determine patentability. Ms. Buskop mentioned the possibility of submitting the amendments with an RCE, or rather just filing an appeal since the examiner would not indicate the allowability of the amended subject matter during the interview. Ms. Buskop stated to the examiner that she believed that further consideration in the instant case inferred a future rejection. Examiner indicated that this was not the case, and that it is office policy for the examiner to consider new issues when they are submitted officially as further consideration is necessary to determine the patentability of the claims due to the change of scope of the new issues to the claims. Examiner stated that he was unable to indicate allowable subject matter without first considering the amendments to the claims as submitted officially. Lastly, before the departure of Ms. Buskop, the examiner also offered the opportunity to speak with others regarding the issue, but she however, declined.